

December 5, 2018

Zoning Board of Appeals

Proceedings by Authority

State of New York,
City of Jamestown, ss:
Council Chambers

The regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Jamestown, New York, was held on Wednesday, December 05, 2018 at 3:30 p.m.

Members Present: Ellen Ditonto, Peter Larson, Sally Martinez, Patricia Calanni

Members Absent: Judith Sandson, Jim Olson

Others Present: Larry Scalise

Mrs. Ditonto called the meeting to order.

Mrs. Ditonto: We have three petition requests on the agenda today. Just a couple of housekeeping items before we get started. We have an opportunity for whoever the petitioner is to come forward once we read the petition to discuss the reason for the need for the petition. Then the board gets to ask some questions. There is an opportunity for anyone in the public at the point that I call for public comment, to go to one of the microphones on either the left or right of the room, state your name and home address and then you have up to five minutes to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the petition, but you must limit your remarks to the petition request. It takes four votes to get approval on any petition request. We have four members of the board here today.

KAITLIN M. AMES, 102 BUFFALO STREET – 370.15-6-3

The petition of Kaitlin M. Ames, 102 Buffalo Street, Jamestown, NY, for an area variance to replace an existing 6' fence with an 8' fence at 102 Buffalo Street, parcel 370.15-6-3. (Section 300-0206 Fences in residential districts: The maximum allowable height for a fence in the rear yard is 6'. Proposed is 8'.)

Mrs. Ditonto: Would you like to come forward; name and home address please and then tell us a little bit more about the reason for the request.

Ms. Ames: Hi, I'm Kathy Ames; I'm Kaitlin's mother. My home address is 42 Hickory Street in Falconer. She is at work today so I am here representing her. The reason for the request is there is a large dog that lives next door. Her fence needs to be repaired as it is anyways, but she's hoping to go to 8' rather than 6' because there is a trampoline right next to the yard and the big dog gets on there and, from chest forward, is above the 6' fence, so she's hoping to increase that to 8'. She does have a small dog and it is a safety concern for not only her and landscapers that have been in the yard, but also her little dog.

Mrs. Ditonto: Okay. Are there questions from members of the board?

December 5, 2018

Mr. Larson: So, the property line we're talking about here is along the east side, so I assume that's on the Buffalo side?

Ms. Ames: Yes, and previously the backyard neighbors have already asked for a variance and have been granted it and their fence has already been put up because they also have small children and small dogs.

Mrs. Ditonto: Can you tell us what type of a fence she's going to put up? Is it a stockade fence?

Ms. Ames: I think she's looking into a vinyl fence, so it will be attractive on both sides for both the neighbor and herself. It's just for safety purposes.

Mrs. Ditonto: Other questions? Seeing none from the board, it's time for the public to have an opportunity to comment on this petition request. If you would like to speak, please go to one of the microphones, state your name and home address and limit your remarks to the question at hand which is placing an 8' fence on the property on Buffalo Street. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak? One more time, is there anyone who wishes to speak on this petition? Seeing none, I will ask the board if they have any final questions. If not, I would be looking for a motion on this petition.

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve the request. Seconded by Ms. Martinez.

Carried: 4 – 0

BARTELETT SIGNS, INC. FOR UPMC, 51 GLASGOW STREET – 387.14-2-19

The petition of Bartlett Signs, Inc., 7628 Klier Drive, Fairview, PA 16415, for an area variance to install two (2) non-illuminated and one (1) illuminated free standing signs at UPMC, 51 Glasgow Street, parcel 387.14-2-19. (Section 300-0205 Visibility at Intersections. The proposed sign locations do not meet setback requirements.)

Mrs. Ditonto: Is there someone representing the petitioner? Please come forward, state your name, address and tell us a little bit more about these three signs at 51 Glasgow. You can hand those out, sure. Are those updated from what we got in the packet?

Mr. Long: They are. Nothing's really changed, it's just a little more organized. We got some new drawings that shows the site plan of where the existing signs are and the proposed sign locations.

Mrs. Ditonto: Okay. Again, if you would state your name and address and then walk us through this packet.

Mr. Long: Michael Long, Bartlett Signs, 7628 Klier Drive, Fairview, PA 16415. There are three signs in question on this campus and they're denoted on the map as 120, 123 and

125. What you have in front of you, and they're stapled together, is the site map and also the proposed signs. The first one we can talk about is sign 120 which is on the corner of Barrett and Glasgow. That sign currently is quite a bit up that hill. It's kind of hard to see as you're traveling along Barrett. We wanted to move it a little bit closer to Barrett so that there's good visibility.

Mrs. Ditonto: I just want to correct you. It's Baker. It's Baker Street and Glasgow if I'm right. It's up the hill?

Mr. Scalise: Actually, it's Barrett as soon as you get to the split, then it turns to Baker.

Mrs. Ditonto: Up to the split? Okay. Sorry, those two streets are right together, so it's difficult.

Mr. Long: So, we're proposing to move that down closer to Barrett for visibility purposes and also to catch traffic that's by the bypass there as well, the exit ramp. We just want everybody to be able to see it. Again, this denotes the campus. You can see the 30' triangle there; I think we're still good. It's a matter of being able to see it clear from Barrett and also that whole intersection there. We are 28' off the curb for the proposed sign location, the current sign is at 45' so we are moving it down a little closer to that intersection just for visibility purposes. Do you want me to run through all three of them and then you guys can ask questions?

Mrs. Ditonto: Well, it's the pleasure of the board. Do you want to take one of these at a time or take all three in this packet?

Mr. Larson: I have a question about this. If I'm looking at this correctly, again, you've identified the 30' triangle. Does that mean that the actual proposed sign location is outside of that?

Mr. Scalise: Actually, I just looked at that and I noticed. The way he drew that isn't quite correct because he does have the corner – it actually would go down along the curve for the 30' which would actually take the hypotenuse back which would place the sign inside the 30'. It's just a matter of where it would start is all.

Mr. Larson: I see.

Ms. Martinez: And they're not going to be in any situation of causing the traffic to not be able to see?

Mr. Long: No, I've traveled there and I went back and forth through that location and that sign is well set back. I can see very clearly, even if I do not pull all the way up to that intersection. I think it's set back quite a good distance, although it still is an encroachment to the current zoning law.

Mrs. Ditonto: The sign that you're proposing is taller than the one that's there, am I correct?

December 5, 2018

Mr. Long: It is.

Mrs. Ditonto: The current sign is 7' total with the stakes in terms of height.

Mr. Long: Yes, the total height of the sign is 7' and the width is 8' and we're looking at 130", which is close to 11' or roughly a little over 9'. I'm sorry; 8'.

Mrs. Ditonto: Any other questions on this particular location? Okay, do you want to move to the second one then?

Mr. Long: The second one is 123 and there is not an existing sign there at this moment. We're proposing that because it's a matter of wayfinding to direct people to the opioid center, which is just down the road at that entrance. There's nothing there as people are traveling along Barrett. It's just a matter of wayfinding and showing a clear direction to get people around where they need to be at the campus.

Mrs. Ditonto: This one sits back...

Mr. Long: It's 13' off the curb and it's roughly around 5' off the sidewalk. It really is not going to inhibit any visibility while driving.

Mrs. Ditonto: There's no intersection there.

Mr. Long: There's no intersection there, no.

Ms. Martinez: And it's 5' off the sidewalk and it's closest to the building, not as close to the street.

Mr. Long: The closest edge of the sign is 5' from the sidewalk.

Ms. Martinez: Okay. I just think about people walking by.

Mrs. Ditonto: Any other questions on that one? Okay, move to the third.

Mr. Long: So, the third is sign 125 and this is the entrance up to the opioid center. There is not existing sign there at this time. We need to direct people up to that building, there's just no way of anybody knowing that it's there. It's a wayfinding sign. The problem with this intersection is that if I try to put that sign back and put it on either side of Baker or Barrett where that comes together. By the time I get up to that sign and look at that sign, I've already made a commitment to pass that entrance. So, being in the middle is probably the best position for that sign. That way it catches traffic from both directions.

Mrs. Ditonto: Again, the height of that sign is 8', correct?

Mr. Long: The height of that sign is 7'9". And that sign is also 13' off the curb and 5' off the sidewalk.

December 5, 2018

Mrs. Ditonto: Questions on this location?

Mr. Long: Pulling out from Baker onto Barrett – I went through the whole campus today and I could see very well from both directions down Barrett. I just don't see a problem with any hinderance with visibility coming down Barrett and pulling out.

Mr. Larson: I suppose my concern would be actually the people pulling, less in, but I suppose out of the campus onto Baker or Barrett having the obstruction on their left or right, respectively. I could see that being a potential issue. With that sign – I understand your point about having passed it, but perhaps it would be a possibility to place two smaller signs or something either on the other corner of Baker, on the left of the illustration and then on the other corner of Barrett, rather than in that island. The island itself is such a small space and it is smack dab in the middle of those two pull-in spots. That would be my concern there. My question would then be, had that option been considered?

Mr. Long: It hadn't been discussed. Not at this point. It's just such a centralized location there. Even if we were on the opposite end on the left side of Barrett, I guess we could do that, if we put one sign over there, but like I said, people coming down Barrett are going to have a hard time seeing it unless we do put two signs; one on each side of that.

Mr. Larson: Was there any consideration of shorter signs that might be equally visible from anyone driving a car, but that wouldn't have the height to obstruct the view? I've seen smaller signs around the other UPMC campus I believe that are maybe three or four feet high, but don't obstruct anyone's view.

Mr. Long: Well, I get concerned this time of the year with snow and them plowing sidewalks and not having any visibility to it. That's kind of the premise behind that.

Mrs. Ditonto: Other questions? Any other explanation before we open this up?

Mr. Long: The signs work together and all three of them are very important to both identify the campus and to get people to where they need to be.

Mrs. Ditonto: I think one of the questions that did come up – I'm not sure if you answered it, but did you consider any other size signs, especially at that one entryway in that triangle. If you want to come to the microphone and state your name and address. We'll ask you to move the microphone so he can speak into it. Thank you.

Mr. Lightner: Hi, I'm John Lightner. I am at 612 Grange Drive, Apollo, PA, near Pittsburgh. I am with UPMC Sign Planning and Design. For this location, we did think about putting the sign on either side, but because we looked at it and we viewed the size of the sign, we have gone onto other campuses and had – and we didn't do it here – but we have put up full-size prototypes to test these situations out and we've found that the size and this location, we believe, and we respect your opinion also, but we believe that it was a successful plan and does fit in with

getting our people to the destination that they need to go to. We looked at putting signs on the other side and eliminated it because the one sign and the size of it is, is in the right place.

Ms. Martinez: So, the prototypes were fully – they weren't just a pole or a couple of poles? They were actual signs that you had to try to look through?

Mr. Lightner: I did this, personally, at UPMC Northwest in Franklin, PA. We did it full-size. I made a full-size prototype and we put it in the existing locations to consider size. I shouldn't say one. We put three different sized ones to get the correct size in the correct situation for this. That's how we determine size. It's all planned and when we came to this location and looked at it and we know the size of the sign and it is the correct size to be there and we believe that it's in the correct position for that location.

Mr. Larson: But you understand that our concern and the point of the zoning rules here are for safety and visibility at the intersection. I understand that the 8' sign fits your purposes for directing your clients. Of course, we respect that, but our question is about is that going to obstruct visibility at such a point at that entrance and exit. And it's not an overly busy road, typically, but it gets plenty of traffic, so our concern is going to be – if there is one - over the visibility and the size of the sign for that purpose.

Mrs. Ditonto: And I do have to tell you that traffic is a problem at certain points of the day. I would agree that it's not at all points, but I travel that route every morning and every night and there are number of buses that stop right on Baker Street to pick up young children and people are trying to go around them. It is a very busy and congested area. Maybe not so well engineered in terms of how it's set up, but because there's a lot of traffic and congestion there, my concern would be people not being able to have the full visibility from either way through that triangle.

Mr. Long: You may be thinking about it further than I have. We considered people pulling out onto the street from that drive and I think it is acceptable and we thought it was the best plan for that. But you might be looking at it from a different point of view than we are and we respect that too. Safety is our first concern also. If you you're thinking about further back, it's possible that there's a situation there. We just think this is the best place, but it's not the only place.

Mr. Larson: And not to speak to what any votes might be, but what might be helpful if we need it, to go further on this are some photographs illustrating, perhaps using a prototype sign or even using a mock up computer program showing us from the position of somebody pulling in or out of those drives, what are the angles going to be like with that sign there. Because it may not be an issue. If it's far enough back, it may not be an issue at all. It's just difficult to tell from these drawings.

Mr. Lightener: Do we have any pictures? Are there any that have in there that show that?

Mr. Scalise: On the second page. It's not photoshopped, but he tried.

December 5, 2018

Mr. Larson: Yes, I see that. That's more of just a location of the sign and then the other does show the entrance from one direction, but not from the other angle and not in the point of view of somebody leaving the campus pulling out.

Mr. Long: I agree to the point where if people are exiting and they're on Baker and then they're just immediately going from Baker and going onto Barrett, I could probably see a concern there. I think that most people would pull out on Baker, stop, look both ways on Barrett.

Mrs. Ditonto: I think you're assuming too much.

Mr. Larson: That is a bad intersection.

Mr. Long: That was the premise when we put the sign there and looked at it. We thought that would be a safe location for the sign.

Ms. Martinez: And it might block, as our chairman says, it might block, to even to see that there's a bus further down and everything. These are huge, huge signs. I think they're a little large.

Mr. Larson: It is a bad intersection. It is very, very dangerous on the best of days.

Mrs. Ditonto: It is. At this point, we would ask for the public; anyone who would like to speak either for, in favor of the petition to add three signs for UPMC Chautauqua at 51 Glasgow Avenue to go to one of the microphones, state your name and home address and limit your remarks to five minutes only about the petition. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to do that?

Mr. Covert: I'm Harry Covert. I live at 60 Barrett and I hear a lot of this, of traffic, of people supposedly looking, coming out of the driveway onto Barrett Avenue and it's a bunch of garbage. They come down off that hill and out onto Barrett Avenue at 10, 15 mph, never stopping. Just as a sideline, I live on the triangle of Barrett, Baker and Prather. Prather is worse yet, but this is bad. Right now, I'm totally against this. Number one for visibility, number two, I think the legal setbacks are for a very specific purpose. And this does not meet it. Anybody that does not know where they're going into that driveway, I feel sorry for them. But I don't think the sign is going to prove this. The other thing I want to say is, I've lived on that corner for forty years. The aesthetics are beautiful, to look down across that lawn and down to the river and now all of the sudden you're going to put signs up so I can't see and then I don't know where the illumination is going to be either, which bothers me. I guess that's enough.

Mrs. Ditonto: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Larson: Chairman Ditonto, if I may, that does bring up a good question. Which of these signs is going to be illuminated? Because that was not...

Mr. Lightner: 120. On Barrett.

December 5, 2018

Mr. Larson: On the corner?

Mr. Lightner: Yes.

Ms. Meyer: Hillary Meyer 44 Walnut Street. Not having the benefit of pictures or what you're looking at, I just wanted to make sure. Is this the wedge between Prather, Barrett and Baker where the sign is supposed to be? That little triangle island? For the 8' sign?

Mrs. Ditonto: This is at Barrett. Not Prather; Barrett and Baker.

Mr. Larson: It's the wedge that's on their property.

Ms. Meyer: That was it for my question.

Mrs. Ditonto: Thank you.

Mr. Scalise: You had the wrong triangle. She was over Barrett, Prather, Baker.

Mrs. Ditonto: Anyone else in the audience who would like to speak on this petition request for three signs at 51 Glasgow Avenue. One more time, is anyone interested in speaking at the public comment section for 51 Glasgow Avenue. Seeing none, I will proceed. Are there any other further questions from members of the board?

Ms. Martinez: I would like them to rethink the size of the signs.

Mr. Larson: I was going to make a motion on that.

Mrs. Ditonto: As a matter of information, I think that we can vote this petition down, we can provide advice in terms of coming back, we can table it; whatever the board chooses.

Mr. Larson: My motion would be to table this and request that at the next meeting we have some more photographs, maybe illustrating the visibility. My, I don't know about anyone else, my concern is mostly over the 125 location which is the small triangle and also, I would ask that we entertain the idea of a shorter sign that would possibly alleviate that more entirely. It's not going to fix the traffic at that intersection on its own, obviously I understand that, but to not make that worse would be a benefit, I think. My motion again to table pending some further information.

Mr. Larson made the motion to table the request. Seconded by Ms. Martinez.

Carried: 4 – 0

Mrs. Ditonto: Go back to the drawing board, a little bit, on that one with some advice, I think, from the board in terms of the things that we'd be looking for.

Mr. Long: Okay. Just for that one particular sign?

December 5, 2018

Mrs. Ditonto: I think the photos and visibility would be important on all of them, on all three of them. I know one of them is in the middle of the block, it doesn't have a traffic intersection nearby, but it would be nice to have some kind of a prototype so we could see what it would look like in place. And especially on the sign 125, looking at the sign's size as well as, again, looking at the visibility and trying to have a prototype to show us that.

Mr. Larson: On 120, I don't anticipate that visibility being an issue because of the pitch of Glasgow Road going up from there, but yes, I would say the same. Photos would be helpful.

BARTLETT SIGNS, INC. FOR UPMC, 207 FOOTE AVE. – 387.15-4-7.1

The petition of Bartlett Signs, Inc., 7628 Klier Drive, Fairview, PA 16415, for an area variance to install five (5) illuminated free standing signs at UPMC, 207 Foote Avenue, parcel 387.15-4-7.1. (Section 300-0205 Visibility at Intersections. The proposed sign locations do not meet setback requirements.)

Mrs. Ditonto: Thank you. You have updated packets for us? Just for the record, I'll have you state your name and address before you start.

Mr. Long: Michael Long for Bartlett Signs, 7628 Klier Drive, Fairview, PA.

Mrs. Ditonto: Why don't you walk us through each sign and we'll stop and ask questions as we go along.

Mr. Long: Okay. We can start with, on your map, sign 164, that's on the corner of Allen and Foote. There's an existing sign there we are proposing to remove and add new. We do want to bring that sign down closer to that intersection so people from Allen have a good view of that sign. Currently, traveling west, that sign is actually hidden a little bit by that building and I was driving through there today and there's actually a loading dock there and there's a tractor trailer there and you really can't see that sign at that location very well until you're right on top of it. So again, that sign's pretty important to be down close to that intersection so everybody can see it from all directions. That's a very large sign that's denoting the emergency direction, to get to the emergency room, which is on the opposite side of the campus. So, we just want to have good, clear visibility to that sign.

Mr. Larson: And of course, the intersection of Foote and Allen is controlled by a traffic light, a regular traffic signal. Just to make that observation.

Mrs. Ditonto: Do you have specific questions on this sign location? You're moving the original sign, you're going to be moving it closer to Foote Avenue, the new sign?

Mr. Long: Well, it's actually going to move closer to Allen Street.

Mr. Larson: It's right on top of the Foote Avenue sidewalk as it is.

December 5, 2018

Mr. Long: The site map on that shows you where the existing sign is and the dimensions and then the proposed sign as well. Which, even the proposed location is still out of that 30' triangle.

Again, the height of the new signage is?

Mr. Long: 14'7".

Mrs. Ditonto: And that's how much higher than the current sign?

Mr. Long: I don't know that.

Mr. Lightner: Can I approach again? I can answer that.

Mrs. Ditonto: State your name and address and you can speak on that.

Mr. Lightner: My name is John Lightner. I'm at 612 Grange Drive, Apollo, PA. The existing sign is 12'.

Mrs. Ditonto: Thank you. Other questions on that first sign, number 164. Let's move on.

Mr. Long: Sign 186; essentially there is an existing sign there and the new proposed sign is roughly the same size and it's going to be the same distance off of Foote Avenue. Basically, the existing sign is to the left of the flagpoles and this one is going to the right. It's 17' off the road, it's not going to inhibit any visibility for people travelling through there. It is parallel with Foote. It denotes the visitor entrance and the hospital.

Mrs. Ditonto: Questions on that sign location? Again, just so that we're aware, that is not going to be any closer to the entrance where you can pull around in front of the hospital?

Mr. Long: I can't move the sign back any farther. There's a little grassy area there and right behind there is that pull up entrance. It's as far back as it possibly can be.

Mr. Larson: And it's parallel with the existing sign.

Mr. Long: Correct.

Mrs. Ditonto: Any other questions on that one? Okay, move on.

Mr. Long: Sign 218. There's an existing sign there too and we are proposing to move that closer to that intersection. That's the very first large sign on the arterial that everybody sees and again it denotes the emergency direction. We want to move that sign closer to that intersection just because anybody travelling on Arterial, I guess that's northwest, by the time they see where that existing sign is, they're already past Prather. So, we want to move it closer to that intersection. Again, I can't move that sign any farther back because there is literally a parking lot right behind it and it is a 6' drop right there, but we just want to move it closer to the

December 5, 2018

intersection for better visibility from all directions. There is a side street that comes across from there and that sign would be very visible from that point as well.

Mrs. Ditonto: This isn't a question for you, sir, but for Mr. Scalise. Because this is on the Arterial or abutting it, do we not have to have approval from the county planning department?

Mr. Scalise: You are correct and I apologize. I missed that and did not get that sent out. My apologies.

Mrs. Ditonto: We do have to have the county planning department approve it. Even though it's replacing an existing sign, because it's abutting a state highway, they have to weigh in on that. So, we'll have to send the information to them and have them send us back some information whether they believe it will be an issue or not. But we can continue to discuss. Are there other questions on that sign, the one that's at the arterial?

Mr. Larson: Obviously, we'll need to push this sign off as well as the other petition, so I think I would ask that you give us some visuals on the visibility issues that is going to be between the Prather Avenue traffic turning onto Route 60, the arterial, to the right. If I'm visualizing it correctly, it probably won't be an issue, but I do think that would helpful to us if we had some photograph mock ups to see what that visibility issue could do at the new location.

Mrs. Ditonto: Thank you Mr. Larson. Are there other questions on that particular location; number 218? We'll just note that we do have to get approval or a letter saying that it's up to the local zoning board. The county planning board will have to chime in. Okay, we'll move to the next one, 220.

Mr. Long: Sign 220, again, that is going where the existing sign is currently. Again, there's a large drop off in the back of that sign. We'll tuck it back in there as close as we possibly can, away from the street, but basically, it's going to go where the existing sign is. Again, it's wayfinding that denotes the direction to the emergency room.

Mrs. Ditonto: The location, again, is about where the current one is. The size of the sign, though, in terms of the height, it's much higher. The new sign is almost 15', correct?

Mr. Long: 14'7", yes.

Mrs. Ditonto: And the current signs, would you estimate, is it 6' or 8'?

Mr. Long: 6'.

Ms. Martinez: Isn't there a point where it's a little difficult for people to look up to see? If they're driving down, and especially in that area which is relatively speedy, and you do have to stop for the crosswalk at the hospital, but you're kind of looking and trying to look ahead at the traffic and if you have to be reading signs like this at the same time, that seems a little high.

December 5, 2018

Mr. Long: Most of the wayfinding on the sign and the verbiage has to be down toward the bottom of the sign. The top of the sign is just identifying that you're at the campus.

Ms. Martinez: What height is the directions? What height on the sign?

Mr. Long: The directions?

Mr. Lightner: I don't have that document.

Mrs. Ditonto: Based on the drawing here, it must be at the 8' to 10' would you say?

Mr. Long: I would say 10'.

Ms. Martinez: If that's going to be in the right place, then that's okay. I travel that way a lot and if I'm looking – and I'm still trying to find out how to get to the emergency room with all that's going on right now.

Mr. Long: This sign is higher, but it doesn't take up any more width in the footprint than the existing sign.

Ms. Martinez: That's really good.

Mrs. Ditonto: Okay, any other questions on sign 220? Seeing none, let's move to the next one, 236.

Mr. Long: 236 is the emergency entrance sign. There's an existing sign there and we're putting the new sign right in its place. It is more than 30' away from that intersection, so I guess we're just encroaching the 10', but it's basically going where the existing sign is. We can move this sign back, but essentially what we were doing is taking up two more parking spots in that already very small lot for emergency parking.

Ms. Martinez: Yes, you can't do that. That will still service the day use of the hospital as well as the emergency, right? It's not going to change that; for people going in for non-emergency things. I don't think you need to take any spaces away, that could be an issue.

Mr. Long: It's on a 30' triangle at this point.

Mrs. Ditonto: Questions on sign 236, which is at the emergency entrance? Do you want to talk about the illumination of these signs? Generally, we like to know the brightness. Anything you can tell us about the quality of the lighting.

Mr. Lightner: I'm John Lightner, my address is 612 Grange Drive, Apollo, PA and I'm planning the design and I was involved with all of the designs of this. It is all the highest grade of LED lighting and all of the illuminated signs have integral dimmers on them, so that we can adjust the lighting to specific needs and usually we keep it very low anyways. There is a set limit that we find to be the correct one, but if there were issues, even afterwards, we could adjust.

December 5, 2018

Mrs. Ditonto: So, it's not automatic adjustments, it's a manual adjustment that you would make.

Mr. Lightner: Yes, the sign installer would adjust it. If somebody found that they had a problem with it, they should be able to – they all come with integral dimmers that handle that problem.

Mrs. Ditonto: And all five of these signs are to be illuminated at this location, at the main location of UPMC Chautauqua. I'm sure for your information and information we'll have to share with the county planning, they'll need to know what those settings are, especially for the arterial location. For the LED and how that integral dimmer – they'll need to know what you have as your planned setting for those signs.

Mr. Lightner: Okay. We can supply that.

Mrs. Ditonto: That would be helpful. Are there other questions on any of these signs for the main location at 207 Foote Avenue?

Mr. Larson: Are we correct in assuming that the light would be from the bottom up, not the top down?

Mr. Lightner: Integral, inside out.

Mr. Larson. I see, I understand.

Mrs. Ditonto: Other questions? At this point, I would be looking for a motion to table this because we cannot act on it because we do not have the clearance from the county planning board.

Mr. Larson made a motion to table the petition. Seconded by Ms. Martinez.

Carried: 4 – 0

Mrs. Ditonto: We're halfway there. I think it's important that you've gotten the feedback that you did so far. We have to look at the health and safety of our citizens and their traffic patterns, so we appreciate the fact that you came today and that you now have some information that you can take with you and bring us some additional information. Thank you, very much.

Mr. Long: Do you know, is it the next meeting – I guess we'll talk to Larry a little bit and get the new design and come up with a new plan.

Mrs. Ditonto: Yes. And part of it will be how quickly the county planning board planner can react, can get the information and react to that and then they send us a letter and then we can then bring these items off the table. We will keep in touch through either the clerk or Mr. Scalise. Thank you.

December 5, 2018

Ms. Meyer: Can I ask a question please?

Mrs. Ditonto: Yes.

Ms. Meyer: I don't understand the illumination of the signs. So, the signs are going to be LED signs themselves. They're not illuminated with a lamp on a regular type of sign.

Mrs. Ditonto: It's not like a spotlight.

Ms. Meyer: Okay. Can I take an extra packet to study at home or just to see, because I don't know when you were saying number 2818, number 220 and 236, no one mentioned exactly where they were located on the street. I didn't hear any street names.

Mr. Thomas: I can provide one for you Hillary. I can copy what I have.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Todd M. Thomas, Secretary
Zoning Board of Appeals